

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE  
WESTERN DIVISION**

---

DANIEL L. BARBARO,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	No. 2:18-cv-2837-SHL-tmp
	)	
42 U.S.C. 654(3) ALONE, AND APART	)	
CHILD PROGRAM, et al.,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

---

**ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION AND  
DISMISSING PLAINTIFF’S COMPLAINT**

---

Before the Court is the Report and Recommendation (“Report”) of Magistrate Judge Tu M. Pham, (ECF No. 64), recommending that the Motions to Dismiss filed by Defendant Maximus, Inc., (ECF No. 36), Defendants Danielle W. Barnes, Commissioner, Tennessee Department of Human Services (“TDHS”) and the TDHS Child Support Program, (ECF No. 45), and Defendants Shelby County, Tennessee, Juvenile Court of Memphis and Shelby County, Tennessee, Lyttonia Cunningham, Sheldon Y. McCall, Debra Sanders, Joy Touliatos, Shelby County Sheriff’s Office and Mitzi Pollard, (ECF No. 47), each be granted and that Plaintiff Daniel L. Barbaro’s Complaint be dismissed in its entirety. Plaintiff filed an Objection to the Report on August 8, 2019, (ECF No. 65), to which Defendants did not respond. For the reasons outlined below, Judge Pham’s Report is **ADOPTED** and Defendants’ Motions to Dismiss are **GRANTED**.

A magistrate judge may submit to a judge of the court proposed findings of fact and recommendations for dismissal of a complaint for failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B). “Within 14 days after being served with a copy of the recommended disposition, a party may serve and file specific written objections to the proposed

findings and recommendations.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(2); 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). A district court reviews de novo only those proposed findings of fact or conclusions of law to which a party specifically objects. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). After reviewing the evidence, the court may accept, reject or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C).

Plaintiff's objections make conclusory statements about his claims and his legal rights but fail to identify any specific errors in the Report. Rather, he repeats many of the same statements included in the Complaint which fail to specify the factual basis for his position. Vague and conclusory objections to a report and recommendation do not merit review under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b). See Slater v. Potter, 28 F. App'x 512, 513 (6th Cir. 2002) (“The filing of vague, general, or conclusory objections does not meet the requirement of specific objections and is tantamount to a complete failure to object.”); Miller v. Currie, 50 F.3d 373, 380 (6th Cir.1995) (“The objections must be clear enough to enable the district court to discern those issues that are dispositive and contentious.”).

The Court has reviewed the Report for clear error and finds none. Therefore, the Court **ADOPTS** Magistrate Judge Pham’s Report. Defendants’ Motions to Dismiss are **GRANTED** and Plaintiff’s Complaint against Defendants is **DISMISSED** in its entirety.

**IT IS SO ORDERED**, this 26th day of September, 2019.

s/ Sheryl H. Lipman  
SHERYL H. LIPMAN  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE